

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, and 10 are pending in this application.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 6, 8, and 10, and have canceled claims 2, 3, 5, 7, and 9. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

In response to the objection to claims 1-10 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(a), Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 6, 8, and 10 to address the issues raised by the Examiner. In particular, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that the created jobs are daughter jobs, and that the daughter jobs are created from a mother job. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hube* (U.S. Patent No. 5,517,316). As will be explained below, the *Hube* reference does not disclose each and every feature specified in independent claims 6, 8, and 10, as amended herein.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's characterization of the *Hube* reference relative to independent claims 6, 8, and 10. In support of the anticipation rejection, the Examiner asserts that the *Hube* reference discloses "a job creation module that creates at least one daughter job from the executed print job as a mother job on completion of the print job and keeps the created at least one daughter job in a 'held' status (column 6, lines 43-55 and column 8, lines 6-19)." Office Action at page 4. The flowcharts shown in Figures 11 and 12 of the *Hube* reference; however, indicate that *Hube* makes a copy of a parent job to create a daughter job at step 216, and places the daughter job in a printer queue at step 218. The daughter job is then printed at step 228 to terminate the routine. As such, the *Hube* reference does not disclose executing the printing of a parent job, and creating a daughter job on completion of the printing of the parent job as in the claimed subject matter. Thus, for at least

these reasons, the *Hube* reference does not disclose each and every feature specified in claims 6, 8, and 10.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, claims 6, 8, and 10 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Hube*.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hube* in view of *Suzuki et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,213,652 B1). As will be explained below, the combination of *Hube* in view of *Suzuki et al.* would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in independent claims 1 and 4, as amended herein.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to specify that the print execution module executes printing of the mother job, while keeping at least one of the daughter jobs in the 'held' status (this feature is specified in original claim 3, which has been canceled herein). In support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner asserts that the *Hube* reference discloses an apparatus in which the "print execution module executes printing of the mother job, while keeping at least one of the daughter jobs in the 'held' status (see Fig. 11, steps 206, 208, 210, 216, 218, 220, column 7, line 57-column 8, line 19 and column 8, 26-29)." Office Action at page 7. As stated above, however, the flowcharts shown in Figures 11 and 12 of the *Hube* reference indicate that *Hube* makes a copy of a parent job to create a daughter job at step 216, and places the daughter job in a printer queue at step 218. The daughter job is then printed at step 228. In contrast, in the job management apparatus defined in claim 1, the print execution module executes printing of the mother job rather than a daughter job, and keeps one of the daughter jobs in the 'held' status. The *Hube* reference does not disclose or suggest the printing of a mother job while keeping a daughter job in the held status. As the *Suzuki et al.* reference does not cure this deficiency of the *Hube* reference relative to the subject matter

defined in claim 1, the combination of *Hube* in view of *Suzuki et al.* would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in claim 1.

Independent claim 4 defines a job management apparatus that includes a job creation module that executes printing of the mother job and, on completion of the printing of the mother job, creates a daughter job. As discussed above with regard to the anticipation rejection of claims 6, 8, and 10, the *Hube* reference does not disclose executing the printing of a mother job and, on completion of the printing of the mother job, creating a daughter job. As the *Suzuki et al.* reference does not cure this deficiency of the *Hube* reference relative to the subject matter defined in claim 4, the combination of *Hube* in view of *Suzuki et al.* would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in claim 4.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 4 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Hube* in view of *Suzuki et al.*

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1, 4, 6, 8, and 10, as amended herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP051).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.



Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
(408) 749-6900
Customer Number 25920